

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 174 929

CG 013 730

AUTHOR Pilsinger, Erik E.
TITLE Psychological Differentiation and the Socioeconomic and Demographic Backgrounds of a Diverse Group of College Students.
PUB DATE 5 Apr 79
NOTE 32p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Psychological Association (59th, San Diego, California, April 5-8, 1979); Table 2 of marginal reproducibility
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Biological Influences; *Demography; *Environmental Influences; *Family Background; Personality Development; *Psychological Characteristics; Self Actualization; Social Environment; *Socioeconomic Background; Young Adults

ABSTRACT

The effects of a family's socioeconomic status on psychological differentiation were tested separately, using the Hidden Figures Test, the Hidden Pattern Test, and the Modified This I Believe Test performance of 53 male and 87 female white undergraduates who were widely distributed on socioeconomic status and background demographic characteristics. Contrary to the social class hypothesis, father's socioeconomic status was not related to any of the psychological measures. Instead, the socioeconomic status of the respondent's best friend, the size of the home community (inversely), and being of Northern European ethnic heritage showed more consistent prediction across the three analyses. Social class per se is probably less important for psychological development than are biological endowment and particular environmental interactions of the respondent. The importance of the social status of the respondent's best friend suggests that differentiated individuals tend to self-select complex environments in which to act more often than social-class-related multifaceted environments tend to produce differentiated individuals. (Author)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED174929

Psychological Differentiation and the Socioeconomic and
Demographic Backgrounds of a Diverse Group of College Students*

Erik E. Filsinger**
Center for Family Studies
Arizona State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Erik E. Filsinger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the 59th Annual Meetings of the Western Psychological
Association in San Diego, April 5-8, 1979.

*The critical comments of Richard Bord, Paul Baltes, and John Nesselroade
of the Pennsylvania State University to an earlier draft of the present
work were invaluable to the effort.

**Mailing address: Department of Home Economics, Arizona State University,
Tempe, Arizona, 85281.

CG013730

Deprivation hypotheses of social class differences in cognitive functioning state that as a result of inadequate access to societal rewards the cognitive development of individuals lower on the socioeconomic scale is impaired (Bloom, 1964; Hunt, 1961). The assumptions are made that "richer" environments facilitate growth and that the relevant richness is a direct function of socioeconomic status. While there has been fairly consistent evidence of social class differences on standardized intelligence tests (Das, 1973; Eysenck, 1973; Herrnstein, 1973; Jensen, 1973), a variety of reservations have been raised by a number of researchers as to the nature of the evidence for formal-cognitive differences between strata of our society (Baratz & Baratz, 1970; Cole & Bruner, 1971; McClelland, 1973; Zigler & Trickett, 1978). With a few exceptions (e.g., Hess & Shipman, 1965; Riley & Denmark, 1974; Witkins, Oltman, Chase, & Friedman, 1971), the controversy as to the effects of social class on cognitive functioning has been less explicitly debated for cognitive characteristics other than intelligence such as cognitive style.

Because social class does not have a specific psychological referent, one of the criticisms of the social class hypothesis concerns the nature of social class as a variable (Deutsch, 1973; Gruen & Zigler, 1968; Kier, Styfco, & Zigler, 1977; Zigler, 1970; Zigler & Child, 1969). In one statement of this criticism, Lewis (1972) refers to social class as a "carrier variable" which is only loosely associated with the psychological dynamics of human behavior.

Other criticisms of the status of social class as a variable can be raised. Perhaps because of a background in experimental design, some researchers treat social class as a dichotomous variable, e.g., lower- and

middle-class. In contrast most theorists suggest measuring social class in terms of socioeconomic status characteristics and operationalize these as continuous variables (Barber, 1968; Hodge & Seigel, 1969). One problem with dichotomizing social class is that existent populations as defined by neighborhood or school are taken to be the representatives of a given social class. Selection of a sample on that basis often confounds such characteristics as race with socioeconomic status. A more fundamental criticism concerns the loss of information about socioeconomic status involved in collapsing the sample into two classes. Individuals who do not really possess the same status may be grouped together. While it may prove useful to evaluation research to test the effects of an intervention program on an extreme status group compared to all other status levels, that test does not give information about more subtle differences.

A difference exists in the nature of the information gained from operationalizing social class as a dichotomous or as a continuous variable. Theory constructionists show a preference for continuous variables and state that scientific laws generally take the form of an expression of the covariation between two or more variables (Blalock, 1969; Cattell, 1977; Hage, 1972; Marx, 1968). Dichotomous variables can show a difference, but they cannot state the nature of the relationship between a fundamentally continuous variable and a criterion. The investigation of socioeconomic status differences in cognitive functioning should have as its goal the discovery of the form of the relationship. To accomplish that the full information contained in continuous variables should be used, not the data reduction associated with analyzing difference between extreme groups.

Not only should socioeconomic status be operationalized as a continuous variable, but its referent should be understood. Social class is a

macro-level variable referring to a characteristic of the social system, in the present case the societal context of the individual's developmental environment. It does not specifically refer to the micro-level processes associated with such things as family life. Several socialization theories theories of cognitive style do hold that psychological differentiation is associated with particular parental practices (Cross, 1966; Goldstein & Blackman, 1978; Harvey, 1966; Harvey, Hunt, & Schroder, 1961; Schroder, Driver, & Streufert, 1967; Witkin, 1969; Witkin, Dyk, Faterson, Goodenough, & Karp, 1962), but those practices are not the referent of the social class variable, even if some parental practices may be differentially distributed across socioeconomic statuses (Bronfenbrenner, 1959; Kohn, 1963). The social class hypothesis states that, because an individual occupies a certain status in society, his cognitive development will reflect the relative complexity associated with that status. It is on that basis that a number of researchers have suggested that the multifaceted environments of the higher status positions will facilitate cognitive growth (Inkeles, 1969; Schooler, 1972a; 1972b).

One further distinction is merited. It is important to distinguish between the social class characteristics of the childhood socialization environment and those of the adult world. The latter are a result of the individual's own efforts to a much greater extent than is the ascribed status of childhood (Ausubel, Montemayor, & Svajian, 1977). Kohn's (1959) argument that the conforming values inherent in working-class occupations can only be applied to adults, or to parents who hold adult roles. It should be noted that that position does not take into account the evidence for self-selection of occupations in line with existing cognitive style (Witkin, Moore,

4

Goodenough, & Cox, 1977). However, the concern in the present work is not with adult status and its effect on cognitive style. Rather the concern is with discerning the evidence for the effects of the socioeconomic status associated with the adolescent's developmental environment on his psychological differentiation.

Much of the empirical literature does not directly address the relationship between social class and cognitive style as its primary focus; the studies often address other issues with social class as a control variable. As a result the research is not particularly cumulative. The studies containing non-supportive results follow. Schleifer and Douglas (1973) found no social class differences on the Children's Embedded Figures Test (CDFT) when social class was measured by samples from different residential areas of Montreal. Palmer (1970) used a black sample of preschool children and found no difference between social classes on Embedded Figures Test (EFT) performance. Ramirez and Price-Williams (1974) found significant ethnic differences among 4th graders in Portable Rod and Frame scores (PRFT) for whites, blacks, and Mexican-Americans: however, father's occupation did not correlate with the PRFT. Bowd (1974) did not find a relationship between field independence and Blishen's scale of socioeconomic status for boys and girls age 5.4 to 6.5. Also using Blishen's socioeconomic index, Case (1975) found no social class differences on a number of the traditional measures of cognitive differentiation.

In contrast to those findings, a number of studies have found somewhat more positive results. While O'Bryan and MacArthur (1969) did not find that socioeconomic status loaded on the same factor with the Children's Hidden Figures Test (CHFT), the socioeconomic status "factor" did correlate with the factor for non-verbal tests of intelligence on which the CHFT did load.

That finding may suggest an underlying relationship between the constructs. Karp, Silberman, and Winters (1969) did not find a relationship between social class and EFT scores for boys, but they did find a relationship for the Block Design task of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children and the boys' social class. That particular task has been linked to tests of field independence. For four-year-olds, the Hollingshead Two-Factor Index of Social Class was significantly related to CEFT (Mumbauer & Miller, 1970). At the first-grade level, middle-class whites, as defined by school neighborhood, were more differentiated than lower-class blacks or lower-class whites (Gill, Herdner, & Lough, 1968). Zimiles (1970) also measured social class by school location and found that kindergarten and first-grade middle-class whites were more field-independent on the CEFT than were lower-class blacks or lower-class Jews. Similarly, psychological differentiation was significantly related to socioeconomic status as measured by school for every age group of pre-adolescents in a study by Cecchini and Pizzamiglio (1975). Schools, significantly different on Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Class, showed significant differences for preadolescents on the CEFT (Bigelow, 1971). It can be noted that several of these studies had measured social class by neighborhood or by school.

A number of studies apply to adolescents. Vernon (1965) gave a broad battery of intelligence tests to 100 British and 50 West Indian boys. For the British sample, socioeconomic status loaded with the Gottschaldt (Embedded) Figures and the Goodenough Draw-a-Man tasks on a specific factor for perceptual ability seemed to be related to cultural stimuli in the family home, rather than to socioeconomic status. Using summed t-scores of father's education and occupation, Busse (1969) found more flexible thinking among high socioeconomic status adolescents than among either middle or low status adolescents.

It is hard to interpret the meaning of "high," "medium," and "low" status in his study due to the unelucidated t-scoring for the sample. Measuring socioeconomic status of adolescents by their father's and mother's education and occupation, Gruenfeld, Weissenberg, and Loh (1973) found socioeconomic status to be related to EFT for Americans, but a Peruvian sample measuring socioeconomic status by school did not obtain statistical significance for the relationship. Socioeconomic status for adolescents has also been found to be related to analytical thinking as measured by the Paragraph Completion Method (Hunt & Dopyera, 1966).

As can be seen from the brief review, no particular pattern of variables or measurements appears to produce the conflicting results. Support for the social class hypothesis is limited; however, since the tests were often not direct, extreme groups were often selected, and relatively few socioeconomic and demographic variables were used, a multivariate analysis of the hypothesis was justified.

In addition to socioeconomic status the multifaceted nature of the environment could also be linked to demographic characteristics such as rural urban differences, family size, birth order, and ethnic differences (Schooler, 1972a; 1972b; Walberg & Marjoribanks, 1976). These might account for part of the socioeconomic status variance and should be controlled. However, support for the importance of demographic variables has also not always been found (Russell & Sandilands, 1973).

The variables selected for the present study included socioeconomic status characteristics of the adolescent's parents, their marital status, the geographic mobility of the family, the size of the family, and such personal characteristics as sex, age, and vocational area of interest. Since the developmental environment also includes the family and peer group, those variables would be important controls. Of interest among family variables

would be the amount of encouragement for cognitive activities. In line with the examination of socioeconomic status effects on cognitive style, an additional aspect of status would be the status of friends. It was thought that socioeconomic status of one's best friend would be an influential element of the developmental context.

Methods

The sample consisted of 53 white male and 87 white female undergraduates who were taking an introductory social science course which fulfilled university core requirements at a large, Eastern university. They received credit in their course for participation. In order to describe the sample, Table 1 contains statistics on its socioeconomic status and demographic characteristics. Since college students might be thought to be relatively homogeneous on social class it is useful to note that the primary measure of socioeconomic status, the occupational prestige of the respondent's father, was normally distributed on Duncan's (Reiss, Duncan, Hatt, & North, 1961) Index of Socioeconomic Status (SES). The sample's scores ranged from 9 to 94. The distribution had a mean of 55.38, a standard deviation of 21.70, and a skewness of -0.14. The variable was slightly platykurtic, indicating that the sample was well spread out on the range of values for the variable and in no way described a homogeneous population; in fact, the sample represented a wide range of socioeconomic backgrounds. While there was the possibility of a sampling of the relatively better endowed lower-class individuals compared to the selection of middle- and upper-class respondents, the selection would only produce a bias of factors other than socioeconomic status per se were involved, i.e., the sources of the bias. It was felt that the sample represented a broad enough set of background statuses that any raw effects of socioeconomic

status would be evident if they existed.

Father's education was measured on a seven-point scale with score 1 indicating a graduate degree and 7 being less than high school education. Since characteristics of the mother are important in determining the socialization environment (Witkin *et al.*, 1962), the mother's educational level and job status were ascertained. The mother's job status was coded as either not working outside the home or holding a job. As a further clarification of the developmental environment, the respondents were asked the occupation of their best friend's father, the reference being to high school friendships. It was measured on Duncan's SES Index. Size of the respondent's home community was measured on a five-point scale. Large urban areas scored 5. The parents were scored as either married and living together or not. In line with anticipated ethnic differences, respondents of Northern European or Jewish ancestry were separated from other ethnic backgrounds in the anticipation that they would be more psychologically differentiated. Raw scores of the number of times the family had moved during the respondent's childhood were used. Also ascertained were the number of siblings, whether the respondent was first born or not, and sex, age, term standing (3 terms per year), and the major area of collegiate study, hard sciences coded 1, all others coded 0. Home environment was a variable assessing parental support for growth-related activities such as reading or taking books out of the library. The scale correlated with the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (Cross & Kawash, 1968) subscale "Excluding Outside Influences" (Filsinger, in press-a).

The respondents were given class credit for volunteering to complete a questionnaire seeking the information just outlined. In addition, several paper-and-pencil tests of psychological differentiation were included: the Hidden Figures Test (HFT)¹, the Hidden Patterns Test (HPT), and the Modified

This I Believe Test (MTIB), the latter test involving the scoring of written protocols for the structural characteristics of differentiation, articulation, and integration (Filsinger, in press-b).

Differentiation referred to a number of dimensions employed in describing a stimulus object, articulation to the number of gradations in any one dimension, and integration to the explicit interrelating of differentiated or articulated parts of a description. These characteristics were scored from written protocols under the semi-projective assumption that the structure of a response corresponded to the cognitive structure of the respondent. The rating of the MTIB was done by two female judges, interrater reliabilities above 0.90. Satisfactory test-retest reliability and validity coefficients were obtained. The reliabilities were 0.64, 0.66, and 0.69 for differentiation, articulation, and integration. Wyer's (1964) measures of differentiation (D1) and Integration (I1) significantly correlated with the respective measures.

The following statistics describe the distributions of the cognitive variables. The mean for HFT was 4.13, its standard deviation 3.44, its skewness 0.99, and its kurtosis 0.76. For the HPT, the same statistics were 75.97, 19.68, -0.76, and 1.01; for the MTIB differentiation 2.08, 1.26, 0.75, and 0.69; for articulation 5.14, 1.30, -0.73, and 0.12; and, for integration 1.60, 1.25, 1.14, and 1.59. These deviations from normality were not judged serious enough to invalidate significance testing and the range of scores was considered varied enough to test hypotheses.

The strategy for data analysis was to use the three sets of tests of psychological differentiation, in separate regressions on the socioeconomic and demographic variables. For the HFT and the HPT, multiple regression was chosen and for the three measures of the MTIB, canonical correlation was most appropriate. The use of the three sets of analyses provided convergent validity to the findings.

Findings

As a first step in the multivariate analysis, the zero-order correlation coefficients were examined. Few of the independent variables were statistically related to the cognitive variables (See Table 2). It did not appear that a regression of the dependent variables on the independent variables would be seriously distorted by the interrelationship among the independent variables. For example, if father's occupational prestige and father's education were significantly related to HFT performance, their high interrelationship with each other would have distorted their respective regression coefficients, but since neither relate to HFT the controlling of the mutual variance between them would not greatly effect the interpretation of the Beta weights. Multicollinearity was shown only between variables which did not have a zero-order effect on cognitive style, e.g., father's occupation and education, father's and mother's education, and respondent's age and term standing. Size of home community and sex were the only variables which seemed to have general, i.e., significant on two or more of the five cognitive measures, zero-order effects on psychological differentiation.

Table 2 about here

The multivariate analyses are summarized in Table 3. In each analysis the independent variables were entered simultaneously. The regression of HFT on the independent variables did not explain a significant proportion of the variance ($F(16,123)=1.12$). Several of the individual standardized regression coefficients (Beta weights) were statistically significant. Mother's working was negatively related to HFT performance, as was the size of home community. Males outperformed females. The social class of the best friend

was related to HFT, but the respondent's SES was not. On the HPT, size of home community was negatively related to psychological differentiation. Northern Europeans and Jews outperformed other ethnic groups and a supportive home environment was associated with higher HPT performance. However, the regression did not explain a significant proportion of variance in HPT ($F(16,123)=0.79$).

Table 3 about here

The interpretation of the weights for the MTIB rested on the particular combination of dependent variables which emerged. That canonical variable was negatively related to integration, but positively related to differentiation and articulation. The composite variable appeared to place individuals high on differentiation and articulation at one end of a continuum. Overall, the analysis was not significant ($\chi^2(5)=63.66, p=.06$). To interpret the individual effects, an arbitrary value of 0.30 was chosen. Using that criterion, lower father's education was related to the dependent canonical variate. Similarly the canonical variate was related to best friend's SES and size of home community, the latter effect opposite those in the previous two analyses. The individuals high on the canonical variate were also more likely to be Northern European or Jewish.

The point of conducting the three analyses was to gain a sense of convergence which would not be provided by only one test of the hypothesis that social class was related to psychological differentiation. The major finding was a lack of support for the importance of the independent variables used in the present study for predicting adolescents' cognitive style. At the level of individual effects and using the rule of thumb that supportive

results for a variable in two or more of the analyses indicated a probable effect, three variables emerged as important. Best friend's SES was positively related to psychological differentiation, but not necessarily to integration. The smaller the home community, the more likely the respondent was differentiated on the perceptual tests, HFT and HPT, but less differentiated on the MTIB. In addition, Northern Europeans and Jews were more likely to be differentiated. Clearly, there is no support for the hypothesis that the socioeconomic status of the family environment in which the individual was socialized is important for the development of a differentiated cognitive style, and, as was seen in the description of the sample, a wide range and distribution of socioeconomic statuses were represented.

Discussion and Conclusions

Several aspects of the findings generate additional speculation. That best friend's SES was more important than own SES may give evidence as to the influence of nonfamilial factors, e.g., friends, but another interpretation is also plausible. Recently interest has risen in the ability of individuals to select the environments in which they choose to act (Blass, 1977; Bowers, 1973; Wachtel, 1972). Witkin and his colleagues (1977) have shown that individuals tend to make career choices and to change career preparation so as to maximize the fit of cognitive style with occupation. The relationship between best friend's SES and psychological differentiation may indicate that more differentiated individuals select the more multifaceted environments of friends from slightly higher SES position than they themselves were raised in. Such a thought merits further research.

The study also places some limitations on the general applicability of socioeconomic status explanations of cognitive style. Characteristics of the social system may be more important between societies than within societies. Witkin and Berry (1975) document that in cultures characterized by high valuation of social conformity low psychological differentiation occurs. To the extent that elements of our social stratification system are not separate cultures, differences among environments are probably not extreme enough to produce the cognitive differences found between cultures. While several researchers have found within society variation (Kohn & Schooler, 1969; Kohn & Schooler, 1973; Pearlin & Kohn, 1966); others have suggested that occupational prestige may be less important than education (Wright & Wright, 1976). It should also be recalled that the deprivation hypothesis suggests that childhood environment, not adult occupational role, is the causative factor in psychological development.

To the extent that some have argued that conforming versus self-directing values are differentially distributed across the stratification system (Hess, 1970; Kohn, 1963; Kohn & Schooler, 1969), cognitive style in some studies might appear to be related to socioeconomic status; however, the relationship would be spurious because the socialization variables and not the stratification variables would be primary. Perhaps the lack of evidence for social class effects in the present study resulted from parents with more facilitative values sending their children to college. Nevertheless, there would be no support for a social class speculation.

Several findings may be in line with an interpretation of the conforming versus self-directing hypothesis. The fact that Northern Europeans tended to be more differentiated on the HPT and the MTIB might have resulted from ethnic subcultures, perhaps as translated at the family level. It is interesting

to note that the size of the home community correlated in the unexpected direction of smaller communities producing more differentiated adolescents. Cities may be more peer-oriented (Ausubel *et al.*, 1978) and therefore conforming, resulting in lower differentiation on the HFT and HPT. On the other hand, the verbal measure, MTIB, produced the opposite results with urban individuals more differentiated. Perhaps the integration required in the MTIB is a higher function and common to HFT and HPT performance. In the same vein, higher father's education was related to high integration on the MTIB.

Since the overall social structural characteristics may not be particularly important, it is likely that the real causative factors lie at the micro-level of the family (Zigler, 1970). Witkin and his colleagues (1962) found that the origins of psychological differentiation lay in the handling of the child's separation from the mother, the regulation of impulse expression, and characteristics of the mother. Other researchers have suggested that interdependent training facilitates differentiation (Cross, 1966; Harvey *et al.*, 1961). It is probably more at this specific level where the environment confronts the child and vice versa that stylistic tendencies are developed (Zigler & Child, 1969).

It can also be pointed out that other "person" level variables may be crucial to fully understanding cognitive style. There is some evidence from twin studies (Murawski, 1971) and adopted-versus own-child studies (Claeys, 1973) that cognitive style may in part be genetically determined.

Even though the sample was well distributed on SES, the findings should not be overgeneralized. The sample was limited to a specific age group who possessed the trait in common of attending a university at the same time. The study does not test what are probably the real contingencies of cognitive

development; it suggests what is not important. Further research should focus on the specific contingencies of the person's biological endowment and the histories of environmental interactions. Admittedly the present sample and variables do not provide conclusive evidence against social class differences. But at least for samples comparable to the present sample, the importance of socioeconomic status does not obtain. Perhaps only extreme levels of social-class-related deprivation result in cognitive impairment. At any rate the overall status differences in society remain questionable until proven and cannot be assumed. Indeed, as evidenced by the greater importance of friend's social class, individuals of different cognitive style may select their social class rather than vice versa.

References

- Ausubel, D. P., Montemayor, R., & Svajian, P. Theory and problems of adolescent development (2nd ed.). New York: Grune & Stratton, 1977.
- Baratz, S. S., & Baratz, J. S. Early childhood intervention: The social science base of institutional racism. Harvard Educational Review, 1970, 40, 29-50.
- Barker, B. Introduction to social stratification. In D. L. Sills (Ed.), International encyclopedia of the social sciences (Vol. 15). New York: MacMillan, 1968.
- Bigelow, G. S. Field dependence - field independence in 5- to 10-year-old children. Journal of Educational Research, 1971, 64, 397-400.
- Blalock, H. M., Jr. Theory construction: From verbal to mathematical formulations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Blass, T. On personality variables, situations, and social behavior. In T. Blass (Ed.), Personality variables in social behavior. Hillsdale, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1977.
- Bloom, B. Stability and change in human characteristics. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- Bowd, A. D. Factorial independence of perceptual egocentrism. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1974, 38, 453-454.
- Bowers, K. S. Situationism in psychology: An analysis and critique. Psychological Review, 1973, 80, 307-336.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. Socialization and social class through time and space. In E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), Readings in social psychology, 3rd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1959.

- Busse, T. V. Child-rearing antecedents of flexible thinking. Developmental Psychology, 1969, 1, 585-591.
- Case, R. Social class differences in intellectual development: A neo-Piagetian investigation. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 1975, 7, 244-261.
- Cattell, R. B. The grammar of science and the evolution of personality theory. In R. B. Cattell & R. M. Dreger (Eds.), Handbook of modern personality theory. New York: Wiley, 1977.
- Cecchini, M., & Pizzamiglio, L. Effects of field-dependency, social class, and sex of children between ages 5 and 10. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1975, 41, 155-164.
- Claeys, W. Primary abilities and field independence of adopted children, Behavior Genetics, 1973, 323-338.
- Cole, M., & Bruner, J. S. Cultural differences and inferences about psychological processes. American Psychologist, 1971, 26, 867-876.
- Cross, H. J. The relation of parental training conditions to conceptual level in adolescent boys. Journal of Personality, 1966, 34, 348-365.
- Cross, H. J., & Kowash, G. F. A short form of PARI to assess authoritarian attitudes toward child rearing. Psychological Reports, 1968, 23, 91-98.
- Das, J. P. Cultural deprivation and cognitive competence. In N. R. Ellis (Ed.), International review of research in mental retardation (Vol. 6). New York: Academic Press, 1973.
- Deutsch, C. P. Social class and child development. In B. M. Caldwell & H. N. Ricciuti (Eds.), Review of child development research (Vol. 3). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1973.

- Eysenck, H. J. The inequality of man. San Diego: Edits, 1973.
- Filsinger, E. E. A numerical typology of cognitive styles derived from beliefs about societal institutions. Dissertation. Abstracts International, in press (a).
- Filsinger, E. E. An objective scoring procedure to assess cognitive style from open-ended verbal responses: The Modified This I Believe Test, The Psychological Record, in press (b).
- Gill, N. T., Herdner, T. J., & Lough, L. Perceptual and socioeconomic variables, instruction in body orientation, and predicted academic success in young children. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1968, 26, 1175-1184.
- Goldstein, K. M., & Blackman, S. Cognitive style: Five approaches and relevant research. New York: Wiley, 1978.
- Gruen, G., & Zigler, E. Expectancy of success and the probability learning of middle-class, lower-class, and related children. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1968, 73, 343-352.
- Gruenfeld, L. W., Weissenberg, P., & Loh, W. Achievement values, cognitive style, and social class: A cross-cultural comparison of Peruvian and U.S. students. International Journal of Psychology, 1973, 8, 41-49.
- Hage, J. Techniques and problems of theory construction in sociology. New York: Wiley, 1972.
- Harvey, O. J. System structure, flexibility, and creativity. In O. J. Harvey (Ed.), Experience, structure, and adaptability. New York: Springer, 1966.

- Harvey, O. J., Hunt, D. E., & Schroder, H. M. Conceptual systems and personality organization. New York: Wiley, 1961.
- Herrington, R. J. I.Q. in the meritocracy. Boston: Little, Brown, 1973.
- Hess, R. D. Social class and ethnic influences on socialization. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's manual of child psychology (Vol. 2, 3rd. ed.). New York: Wiley, 1970.
- Hess, R. D., & Shipman, V. C. Early experience and the socialization of cognitive modes in children. Child Development, 1965, 36, 869-886.
- Hodge, R. W., & Siegel, P. M. The measurement of social class. In D. L. Sills (Ed.), International encyclopedia of the social sciences (Vol. 15). New York: MacMillan, 1968.
- Hunt, J. McV. Intelligence and experience. New York: Ronald, 1961.
- Hunt, D. E., & Dopyera, J. Personality variation in lower-class children. Journal of Psychology, 1966, 62, 47-54.
- Inkeles, A. Social structure and the socialization of competence. Harvard Educational Review, 1969, 36, 265-283.
- Jensen, A. R. Educability and group differences. London: Methuen, 1973.
- Karp, S. A., Silberman, L., & Winters, S. Psychological differentiation and socio-economic status. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1969, 28, 55-60.
- Kier, R. J., Styfeo, S. J., & Zigler, E. Success expectancies and the probability learning of children of low and middle socioeconomic status. Developmental Psychology, 1977, 13, 444-449.
- Kohn, M. L. Social class and parental values. American Journal of Sociology, 1959, 64, 337-351.

- Kohn, M. L. Social class and parent-child relationships: An interpretation. American Journal of Sociology, 1963, 68, 471-480.
- Kohn, M. L., & Schooler, C. Class, occupation, and orientation. American Sociological Review, 1969, 34, 659-678.
- Kohn, M. L., & Schooler, C. Occupational experience and psychological functioning: An assessment of reciprocal effects. American Sociological Review, 1973, 38, 97-118.
- Lewis, M. Introduction. Human Development, 1972, 15, 75-76.
- McClelland, D. C. Testing for competence rather than for "intelligence." American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 1-14.
- Marx, M. H. The general nature of theory construction. In M. H. Marx (Ed.), Theories in contemporary psychology. New York: MacMillan, 1968.
- Mumbauer, C. C., & Miller, J. O. Socioeconomic background and cognitive functioning in preschool children. Child Development, 1970, 41, 471-480.
- Murawski, B. J. Genetic factors in tests of perception and the Rorschach. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1971, 119, 43-52.
- O'Bryan, K. G., & MacArthur, R. S. Reversibility, intelligence, and creativity in nine-year-old boys. Child Development, 1969, 40, 33-45.
- Palmer, F. H. Socioeconomic status and intellectual performance among Negro preschool boys. Developmental Psychology, 1970, 3, 1-9.
- Pearlin, L. I., & Kohn, M. L. Social class, occupation, and parental values: A cross-cultural study. American Sociological Review, 1966, 31, 466-479.
- Ramirez, M., & Price-Williams, D. R. Cognitive styles of children of three ethnic groups in the United States. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1974, 5, 212-219.

- Reiss, A., Duncan, O., Hatt, P., & North, C. Occupations and social status.
New York: The Free Press of Glencoe. 1961.
- Riley, R. T., & Denmark, F. L. Field independence and measures of intelligence:
some reconsiderations. Social Behavior and Personality, 1974, 2, 25-29.
- Russell, G. W., & Sandilands, M. L. Some correlates of conceptual complexity.
Psychological Reports, 1973, 33, 587-593.
- Schleifer, M. S., & Douglas, V. I. Moral judgments, behaviour, and cognitive
style in young children. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 1973, 5, 133-144.
- Schooler, C. Childhood family structure and adult characteristics. Sociometry,
1972, 35, 255-269 (a).
- Schooler, C. Social antecedents of adult psychological functioning.
American Journal of Sociology, 1972, 78, 299-322 (b).
- Schroder, H. M., Driver, M. J., & Struefert, S. Human information processing.
New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967.
- Vernon, P. E. Environmental handicaps and intellectual development: Parts I and
II. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1965, 35, 9-20, 117-126.
- Wachtel, P. C. Psychodynamics, behavior therapy, and the implicable experimenter:
An inquiry into the consistency of personality. Journal of Abnormal
Psychology, 1973, 82, 324-344.
- Walberg, H. J., & Marjoribanks, K. Family environment and cognitive develop-
ment: Twelve analytic models. Review of Educational Research, 1976,
46, 527-551.
- Witkin, H. A. Social influences in the development of cognitive style. In D. A.
Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research. New York:
Rand McNally, 1969.

- Witkin, H. A., & Barry, J. W. Psychological differentiation in cross-cultural perspective. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1975, 6, 4-87.
- Witkin, H. A., Dyk, R. B., Faterson, H. F., Goodenough, D. R., & Karp, S. A. Psychological differentiation: Studies of development. New York: Wiley, 1962.
- Witkin, H. A., Moore, C. A., Goodenough, D. R., & Cox, P. W. Field-dependent and field-independent cognitive styles and their educational implications. Review of Educational Research, 1977, 47, 1-64.
- Witkin, H. A., Odtman, P. K., Chase, J. B., & Friedman, F. Cognitive patterning in the blind. In J. Hellmuth (Ed.), Cognitive studies: Deficits in cognition (Vol. 2). New York: Brunner Mazel, 1971.
- Wright, J. D., & Wright, S. R. Social class and parental values for children: A partial replication and extension of the Kohn thesis. American Sociological Review, 1976, 41, 527-537.
- Wyer, R. S. Assessment and correlates of cognitive differentiation and integration. Journal of Personality, 1964, 32, 495-509.
- Zigler, E. Social class and the socialization process. Review of Educational Research, 1970, 40, 87-110.
- Zigler, E., & Child, I. L. Socialization. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology (2nd ed.). Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1969.
- Zigler, E., & Trickett, P. K. IQ, social competence, and evaluation of early childhood intervention programs. American Psychologist, 1978, 33, 789-798.

Zimiles, H. Conceptual thinking in young children as a function of age
and social class background. Cognitive Studies, 1970, 1, 230-241.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics on the Demographic Characteristics of the
Sample of College Students (N = 140).

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
Father's occupational prestige - SES	55.38	21.70	-0.14	-0.85
Father's education Less than high school ¹	3.08	1.44	0.38	-0.07
Mother's working (working)	0.70	0.45	-0.89	-1.20
Mother's education Less than high school	3.30	1.19	-0.20	-0.48
Best friend's father's occupational prestige	53.95	20.77	-0.30	-0.79
Size of home community	3.62	1.28	-0.23	-1.52
Parent's marital status (Married)	0.85	0.35	-2.03	2.13
Ethnic heritage (Northern European)	0.79	0.40	-1.46	0.12
Number of times family moved	1.72	2.04	1.50	1.73
Home environment (Low support)	1.44	0.86	0.93	1.29
Number of siblings	2.54	1.62	0.89	0.70
Birth order (First born)	0.30	0.46	0.87	-1.25
Sex (Males)	0.37	0.48	0.49	-1.75
Age	18.95	1.14	0.61	-0.25
Term	4.40	2.81	0.51	-0.75
Major (Sciences)	0.15	0.36	1.87	1.51

¹ The attribute given in parentheses indicates the high score for that variable.

Table 2

Zero Order Correlation Coefficients for the Socioeconomic and Demographic Variables and Measures of Cognitive Style.

	<u>Socioeconomic and Demographic Variables</u>															<u>Cognitive Variables</u> ¹					
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
1. Father's occupation prestige - SES	-.58	-.03	-.38	.27	.17	-.01	.14	.22	-.15	.04	-.11	-.07	-.16	-.18	-.03	-.02	-.01	.06	-.01	.06	
2. Father's education (Less than High School)		-.13	.64	-.29	.29	-.02	-.21	-.19	.09	-.02	.01	.08	.27	.23	-.06	.04	.05	.02	.13	-.10	
3. Mother's working (working)			-.29	.01	-.01	-.03	.22	-.04	-.12	-.20	.18	-.06	-.05	-.04	-.08	-.15	-.09	.08	.05	.11	
4. Mother's education (Less than High School)				-.30	-.14	.08	-.25	-.22	.10	.02	-.02	.05	.16	.22	-.01	.08	.08	-.03	-.13	-.19	
5. Best friend's SES					.10	.02	.07	.20	-.01	-.18	-.09	.01	-.15	-.15	-.02	.15	.08	.07	.06	.00	
6. Size of home community						-.22	-.06	.17	-.31	-.05	.02	-.29	-.16	-.10	.07	-.18	-.13	.11	-.13	-.19	
7. Parent's marital status (Married)							-.01	-.11	.11	-.10	-.06	.06	-.01	-.07	-.01	-.01	.03	-.11	-.04	-.09	
8. Ethnic heritage (Northern European)								.12	.05	-.05	.11	-.01	-.05	-.07	.07	.07	.14	.14	.11	.07	
9. Number of time family moved									-.04	.00	.17	-.04	.04	.01	.01	.03	.07	.03	.01	-.09	
10. Home environment (Low support)										.03	-.10	.38	-.04	-.01	.10	.15	-.08	-.15	-.02	-.01	
11. Number of siblings											-.37	.02	-.08	-.08	-.03	-.04	-.05	-.14	-.13	-.18	
12. Birth order (First born)												.04	.27	.26	-.07	.03	.02	.06	.16	-.09	
13. Sex (Male)														.03	.06	.18	.23	.00	-.19	.19	
14. Age																.89	-.06	.07	-.08	-.03	
15. Term																	.00	.08	.06	.01	
																		.01	.09	-.15	

Table 2 continued

	<u>Socioeconomic and Demographic Variables</u>												<u>Cognitive Variables</u>							
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
16. Major (Science)																.02	.00	.08	.02	-.02
17. Hidden Figures Test (Cf 1)																<i>.28</i>	-.09	.05	-.05	
18. Hidden Patterns Test (Cf 2)																	.03	.11	.08	
19. Differentiation																		-.02	<i>.29</i>	
20. Articulation																				<i>.36</i>
21. Integration																				

¹Italicized figures for the cognitive variable indicate statistical significance at $p < .05$.

Table 3

Standardized Coefficients for the Effects of the Demographic Variables on the Measures of Psychological Differentiation.

	Hidden Figures Test Beta Weights	Hidden Patterns Test Beta Weights	Modified This I Believe Test Canonical Correlation Coefficients
Father's occupational prestige - SES	-.04	-.05	.15
Father's education (Less than High School)	-.09	-.06	<u>.94</u>
Mother's working (Working)	-.15*	-.12	.01
Mother's education (Less than High School)	.13	.14	-.05
Best friend's SES	.18*	.10	<u>.31</u>
Size of home community	-.15*	-.19*	<u>.54</u>
Parental marital status (Married)	-.07	-.01	.14
Ethnic heritage (Northern European)	.09	.17*	<u>.40</u>
Family moved	.02	.09	.20
Home environment (Low support)	.02	-.17*	-.22
Siblings	-.04	-.07	.04
Birth order (First born)	.02	-.03	-.08
Sex (Male)	.18*	.00	-.24
Age	.03	.07	-.13
Term	.03	-.03	.19
Major (Science)	-.02	.01	.05
Differentiation			.77
Articulation			.60
Integration			-.99